UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/574,612	06/15/2006	Yousef Al-Abed	3268.1007-004	4212	
	21005 7590 05/14/2009 HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.			EXAMINER	
530 VIRGINIA ROAD			DAVIS, ZINNA NORTHINGTON		
P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, MA 01742-9133			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1625		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/14/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/574,612	AL-ABED ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Zinna Northington Davis	1625				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ice except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21 and 30-44</u> is/are pending in the a	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21 and 30-44</u> are subject to restrict	ion and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P7	O-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive	on No	Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	of the certified copies not receive 4)	(PTO-413) tte				

Application/Control Number: 10/574,612 Page 2

Art Unit: 1625

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 1-21 and 30-44 are pending.

- 2. Claims 22-29 and 45-56 have been cancelled.
- 3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-21, drawn to a chemical compound and a pharmaceutical composition of formula I.
 - II. Claims 30-44, drawn to a method of treating a subject with an inflammatory cytokine mediated disorder using a chemical compound of formula I.
- 4. Inventions I-II are related as product claims. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. For instance, see the claim 41.
- 5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: A_1 , A_2 , Ar_1 , Ar_2 , and R_1 .

The ring system and radicals within the definition of A_1 , A_2 , Ar_1 , Ar_2 , and R_1 are diverse in scope. A prior art reference, which anticipates one member such as pyrazinyl under 35 U.S.C. 102, would not render obvious another member such as pyridinyl under 35 U.S.C. 103. Accordingly, the ring systems and the radicals are independent and patentably distinct.

Application/Control Number: 10/574,612 Page 3

Art Unit: 1625

6. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect **a single disclosed species** for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. If the preferred group is a method of use, a single disclosed disease state should be elected. Currently, claims 1-18, 21, 30-37, and 40-42 are generic.

- 7. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
 - (a) The inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
 - (b) The inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
 - (c) The prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
 - (d) The inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- 8. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election

Art Unit: 1625

shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

- 9. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.
- 10. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Application/Control Number: 10/574,612

Page 5

Art Unit: 1625

11. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

- 12. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.
- 13. Due to the complexity of the restriction requirement, a written request is made.
- 14. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 1625

- 15. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).
- 16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zinna N. Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-0682. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.
- 17. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular communications.
- 18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Zinna Northington Davis/
Zinna Northington Davis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625